Office - Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUL 20 1982
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

82-112

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER 1982

ANNE NEAMON,

Petitioner

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Pro se:
Anne Neamon
P.O. Box 137
McLean, VA 22101

July 20, 1982

QUESTIONS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW

I. Did the Court offend the U. S. Constitution by failing to uphold the U. S. Supreme Court decisions on the Establishment Christian Neutrality Clause in the Authority cases--

a. which permit prayers in Congress, as in the military, and in public schools; and further permit even legislated prayers where a compelling state interest is demonstrated?

b. which deny in government secularism-atheism, hostilities, offense . . . to "general Christian faith which is and always has been a part of our common law," and which values structure the Constitution, Institutions, and Laws, and guide jurisprudence?

II. Did the Court err by--

a. rejecting the Friend Petition on the Authority decisions, the Court

having requested "all information," and then disregarding that information presented by the Friend, denying opportunity to demonstrate that "all information," including rights to prayers, already prevails? Friend Petition, (p. 8).

b. by granting status, even though vacated, to plaintiffs-atheists "under questionable color of taxpayers," seeking for the Court "all information," by omitting the Supreme Court restraints against questionable atheists, plaintiffs, Friend Petition (pp. 1-2), when prayers are permitted?

c. by shifting unnecessarily to the legislative H. Res. 413, when God-given, fundamental rights for orderly religion outrank man-given rights of court-status and Congressional eminent domain, when simple reassertion of the Supreme Court directives permitting prayers,

legislated or unlegislated addresses the issue?

III. Did the Court commit hostility by secular passivity and violate the Establishment Clause neutrality guides to jurisprudence, granting status, even though vacated, to "questionable color of taxpayers," seeking status under the very Constitution they intend to destroy by--

a. ignoring the Friend alert that numerous "synchronized lawsuits" nationwide have been brought by the Murray plaintiff-atheists, who function by "separation of church and state," Soviet Constitution, Art. 52, and are well-known for their harrassment lawsuits to exploit the judiciary by "misrepresenting the Supreme Court decisions on church-state to "test the laws to bring change to the existing order?"

IV. Failing to restrict the taxpayer rights, as the Supreme Court directed for

religious rights, "where under color of religion (so for taxpayers) one disturb the moral order, peace, and safety of society;" and, failing to reaffirm the Supreme Court decisions that prayers are permitted, did the Court offend:

a. Intent of the Constitution?

b. Establishment and Free Exercise Clauses?

c. Art. III, Sec. 1, 3?

d. Art. IV, Sec. 5?

e. Art. VI, Sec. 3?

f. Fourteenth Amendment--equal protection and due process?

V. Does not the judicial process in Murray constitute neglect and mismanagement disservicing the national interest, adding to the Constitutional turbulence on the issue of prayers, which accommodates the invasions to secularize all institutions in this Christian nation, entitled to a Christian administration? Does this not threaten judicial integrity and national security,

considering the national compelling interest, Friend Petition (pp. 1-10), since the Supreme Court permits prayers in Congress, as in schools, and the military? Abington (66, 67 . . .)

SUBJECT INDEX

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	i
OPINION BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	3
I. ARGUMENT - ISSUE ONE	3
SUPREME COURT DECISIONS NOT UPHELD FOR PRAYERS IN CONGRESS; DISINFORMATION STRATEGIES FOR COURT-STATUS AND ATHEISM IN GOVERNMENT	
II. ARGUMENT - ISSUE TWO	19
PRAYERS PERMITTED FOR CONGRESS - DETAILS	
III. ARGUMENT - ISSUE THREE	23
THREE-PRONG TEST	
IV. ARGUMENT - ISSUE FOUR	26
THE NATIONAL COMPELLING INTEREST; INVASIONS OF ATHEISM; AND FAILURE OF COURTS NATIONWIDE TO UPHOLD SUPREME COURT DECISIONS ON THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE	
CONCLUSION	29
APPENDIX	
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

U. S. SUPREME COURT CASES

Abington v. Schempp, U. S. 142, 119, (pp. 20, 22, 24, 27, 28, 31, 32, 42, 48, 52, 55, 66, 67, 71, 73, 74)

Engel v. Vitale, U. S. 369, 1962 (pp. 8, 11, 14, 15)

Everson v. Board of Education, U. S. 330, 1, 1947

Holy Trinity v. United States, 143, 1892 (pp. 460-471)

Roemer v. Maryland Public Works, U. S. 74-730, 1976 (p. 7)

Sydell Stone v. Graham, U. S. 80-321, 1980 (p. 3)

OTHER THAN SUPREME COURT CASES

Kevin Walder v. First Orthodox Presbyterian Church

San Francisco; California State Supreme Court, 760-028, 9, (1980). "Freedom of religion is so fundamental to American history that it must be preserved even at the expense of other rights which have become institutionalized by the Democratic process" (Referring to the priority of Freedom of Religion over Congressional eminent domain herein.)

Note: All page numbers relate to numbers of reprints of the Library Congress of the U. S. Supreme Court Slips.

AUTHORITIES OTHER THAN COURT CASES

U. S. Constitution

a. Intent of the Constitution?

b. Establishment and Free Exercise Clauses?

c. Art. III, Sec. 1, 3?

d. Art. IV, Sec. 5?

e. Art. VI, Sec. 3?

f. Fourteenth Amendment--equal protection and due process?

Public Law

Title 36, U.S.C. 172 ONE NATION UNDER GOD, Legislative history on "invading rabid communism"

Title 18, U. S. Criminal Code, Sec. 241-242, 2000d, 2384--seditious conspiracy

Supporting Documents

Foreign Documents

Soviet Constitution, Annex A, Art. 1, 25, 52, 169

Current Communist Goals, Congressional Record, Dr. Cleon Skousen, Jan. 10, 1963

Domestic Administrative Documents

GAO Reports: Federal Aid to Education:

HRD 81-65 September 15, 1981

HRD 77-34, April 1977

HRD April 15, 1977

HRD 75-165, September 8, 1977

National Institute of Education

"Effects of Services on Student Development"

"Administration of Compensatory Education"

Other

Rand Report, April 1975 R 1589/4 (Similar to GAO Reports)

Report, Senator Zorinsky to Clairborne Pell, March 3, 1978

School Board Member's REVIEW OF EDUCATION 1981

National NFD Report--subversion in TV (paralleling subversion in education

OPINION BELOW

The United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, granted status, declaring "no credibility question," J. McKinnon (p. 5), to plaintiff-atheists in Murray, challenging tax-supported Chaplaincies in U. S. Congress. The Court remanded to the lower court for "all information for future guides," overlooking the existing Supreme Court directives that prayers in Congress are permitted. The Court held that the tax-payment of Congressional Chaplains is not, under tests of the Supreme Court, a political question, and is justiciable.

The Court vacated this decision on May 25, 1982, rejecting the appeals of Intervenor Senator Jessie Helms, and Friend Anne Neamon, and accepting the appeal of the House of Representatives for a Hearing en banc by H. Res 413 for dismissal of the case because of the impact on the Constitutional separation of powers.

The details are set forth in the Appendix. TEN COPIES OF THE FRIEND PETITION ARE SUBMITTED.

JURISDICTION

The decision to vacate the case of Murray v. Buchanan was determined by the Court of Appeals on May 25, 1982. This petition is filed within sixty days of that decision. Jurisdiction is evoked under Title 28, United States Code, Paragraph 1254 (1).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Appeals Court rejected the Petition of Anne Neamon, a Friend of the Court, responding to the Court request for "all information for future guides." The Friend focused on the Authority cases which permit prayers in Congress, that court-status to atheists is unconstitutional by those decisions, and that shifting to the legislative option, H. Res 413 was unnecessary. Since prayers are permitted, there is no substantive Constitutional violation, and "no case."

The Friend alerted the Court on the national compelling interest, citing official reports and other sources to support the contention. Ten copies of the Friend Petition are submitted.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

I. ARGUMENT - ISSUE ONE - U. S. Supreme Court decisions on church-state; Supreme Court guides on prayers permitted for Congress; and disinformation strategies for court-status and atheism in government.

From Holy Trinity, 1892, to Sydell Stone, 1980, the Supreme Court has consistently propounded the founding religious principles which structure the U. S. Constitution:

> ". . . we are founded to legislate, propagate, and secure general Christian faith, which is and always has been our common law . . . Nothing be done to hurt Christianity . . . Bring infidels and savages unto human civility for a quiet and settled government . . . Enter into confederations to maintain and preserve the purity of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus . . . The morality of the nation is deeply ingrafted upon Christian faith . . . We are a Christian people . . . There is no dissonance . . . These are not individual sayings of private persons . . . they are organic utterances . . . to revile with blasphemous contempt the religion

> professed by almost the whole community is an abuse of that right . . .
>
> Passing into view of American life, in law, business, custom, and society, the same truth is recognized. This and many other matters which might be noticed add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation." Holy Trinity, decision of the Court (pp. 460-471). [Emphasis added.]

All free nations in Western Civilization are guided in law and jurisprudence by Christian faith, authority higher than man and his shifting political whims, corruption, greed, and instability. The U. S. Constitution was structured upon traditional (unsubverted) Biblical morality--Christian ethics as guides to government administration. The Intent of the Constitution directs JUSTICE, which is based on stable values--authority higher than man and his shifting whims . . .

To permit "infidels and savages," Holy Trinity and "corrupt coalitions," Madison, Everson (p. 40 ftn) to invade the nation's institutions misrepresenting the Supreme

Court decisions with coalition supports of mass media, undermines the Establishment Clause vital safeguards of Christian ethics. These ethics secure the moral order for all orderly freedoms, by individual rights and private means to protect against invasions, forbidden by Art. IV, Sec. 4, U. S. Constitution.

Militant atheists, as self-identified by policies and actions in nationwide harrassment lawsuits, function by atheistic standards which are incompatible and contrary to the U. S. Constitution. Friend Petition (pp. 1-10).

Atheists do not comprehend that the First Amendment acknowledges the existence of God, by the very guarantee of Free Exercise. Atheists have no regard for Christian law. They simply invade, usurp, and impose the well-known systems of threats, reprisals, and personal gains for those who accommodate their invasions.

Since 1920, the ACLU undertook synchronized actions to secularize the educational system of the nation, according to documented evidence, while the National Education Association undertook to impose in curriculum the doctrines of the Soviet Constitution (Annex A, Art. 1, 25, 52, 169) for "communist morality, classless society, centralized education, separation of church and state, worldwide atheism, and workers of all nations, unite." Not only were attacks made by ACLU against prayers, but against the Bible for morals, Christian ethics in curriculum, and Christian holidays.

Since 1962, numerous court decisions have failed to uphold the Supreme Court decisions of Engel, 1962, and Abington, 1963, both cases identifiable as "plotted cases," with weak defenses which compelled the Supreme Court to rule out legislated prayers, since the defense admitted the sole purpose was to "promote religion," and since the defense attorneys failed to demonstrate a

compelling state interest. It is significant that this pattern of "weak defenses" in prayers cases in similar details is usual in the numerous nationwide cases which swept the nation by ACLU and the Murray atheists-plaintiffs. Both organizations declare dedication to "separation of church and state," Art. 52, Soviet Constitution. It is significant that the Supreme Court decisions which permit prayers in Congress, in the military, and in schools should have been obscured in Murray as in many other cases. Neither the Murray Court, nor Congress, made any attempt to identify and uphold the Supreme Court cases which permit prayers in Congress.

The U. S. Constitution, by Supreme Court decisions, directs Christian law priority and Christian neutrality as guides to government administration. The Supreme Court favorable guides on church-state follow with consistency from Holy Trinity, 1892, to Sydell Stone, 1980:

Christian law priority, Christian neutrality guide government administration. Stemming from Holy Trinity, Engel (p. 8) decision, reiterated from Everson, J. Rutledge (p. 65):

> ". . . Who does not see that authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, can with the same authority establish one Christian Sect over another . . ."

Clearly, Christian law priority and Christian neutrality are the guides to law and jurisprudence. The Murray Court evaded this firm foundation for fundamental rights.

Not separation, but Christian neutrality - Invading coalitions persist in misrepresenting the U. S. Supreme Court decisions with mass-media support that the Supreme Court ruled out prayers, Bible, Ten Commandments by "separation of church and state for atheism in government." The Murray Court and the Congressional evasion of the Supreme Court decisions favoring prayers supports the invasion

unconstitutionally, the Petitioner contends. The favorable guides for the prayers have been methodically obliterated in all branches of government with over-powering abuse of tax-funds and government facilities to expel Christian ethics out of government administration.

Atheism and Theism are incompatible. It is irrational to expect that Christian neutrality must accommodate atheism in government. Abington, (pp. 28, 32, 42, 55, 66, 71, 72, 73) declared unconstitutional "secularism, secular passivity, hostilities, jeopardy, oppression, offense, inhibition, prohibition" to Christian law priority, and Christian neutrality which structure the U. S. Constitution.

Roemer, decision (p. 7), 1976, directed that "separation was never required," and that "scrupulous neutrality"--Christian neutrality--was.

This decision, as reaffirmations in Abington reassertions from many earlier cases, stems from Holy Trinity, which propounds the values which structure the Constitution. Christian neutrality denies government status for any who are hostile to those Christian ethics. The Murray plaintiff-atheists are noted for their hostility to Christian faith, The American Atheist monthly magazine, while enjoying tax-exemption from a Constitution which guarantees freedom of religion (but not for those who under color of religion disturb the moral order, peace, and safety of society). Similarly, while attacking the founding religious principles of a Christian nation, the Murray plaintiffs-atheists impose "separation" to misrepresent the Supreme Court decisions when prayers are permitted in Congress (in military and in schools, whether

legislated or unlegislated). Abington, (pp. 66, 67)

"Separation" advocates, therefore, by the Supreme Court, do not have protection by the very Constitution they intend to destroy, seeking court-status.

It is important to consider the Sydell Stone, 1980, case which had the usual defects in the defense, while the administering Attorney General found entry into a convenient judgeship shortly thereafter. It is important that J. Lukowsky, Kentucky Supreme Court and associates, in Sydell Stone (1980) denounced Biblical ethics and advocated atheism as guides to jurisprudence. The Supreme Court in Sydell reaffirmed that Biblical, Christian ethics are permitted in curriculum. The defense defect in Sydell was the same as in many other cases--the absence of demonstrating the compelling state interest to justify legislated

action to protect a moral order, to secure against invading corrupt coalitions. Madison, Everson (p. 40, ftn), stemming from Holy Trinity, "Nothing be done to hurt Christianity, which is and always has been a part of our common law."

Abington is an ideal court-precedent case on prayers and neutrality, because it brings together many earlier cases, all stemming consistently from Holy Trinity. Because it is so adequate, the invading coalition has attempted to misrepresent the issue, and to declare Abington as "not ideal," because it was heard on demurrer. This is judicially incorrect.

The plaintiff in Abington is the very same plaintiff in Murray. Having failed to prove coercion, a requirement of the Free Exercise clause, Murray, now O'Hair in the Murray case, with mass media, and ACLU coalitions

disinformed the public that the Court "ruled out prayers." From there, the ACLU and its coalitions with bully tactics against school officials, threatened lawsuits "if one cent is spent to promote religion." Sen. F. T. Gray, State of Virginia Legislator, letter, January 6, 1977, to Citizens for God & Country. Letter, March 4, 1981, Kentucky Heritage Foundation, Louisville, Kentucky, alerting the public of the ACLU threats to school board members if they apply the Ten Commandments (which were not presented by the "making of any law"). This strategy of disinformation, threats, and reprisals; and bribes by career enhancement for those who accommodate still prevails. This "invasion", forbidden by Art. IV, Sec. 4, violates the Constitution. Yet, many courts, nationwide, provide questionable court-status to the coalition of ACLU and the Murray

plaintiffs-atheists, advancing their alien enemy doctrine of total "separation for atheism in government," unconstitutionally.

Abington (pp. 28, 71) directed that not only secularism, but secular passivity are unconstitutional, and that it is "the duty of government to deter no-religion belief."

The Supreme Court must take notice that the term "no secularism" in defining Christian neutrality, and the term, "secular purpose" in defining the three-prong test requested by the Murray plaintiff on objectives of prayers, are ambiguous terms which invite confusion and misdirection for atheism. This is a serious Constitutional injustice; a term better applied would be "civic" to distinguish from "secularism-atheism." It is this confusion by the Supreme Court omissions and other details which has contributed

heavily to the invasions for the moral turbulence in this Christian nation and, now, the challenge to Congressional prayers. The Supreme Court can and must correct this basic cause of the moral crisis.

3. Superintendent's authority was not usurped. Unlegislated prayers, as those in Congress, are not in conflict with the First Amendment, which addresses the "making of a law" as a violation. It is for this reason that the coalitions, since 1920, undertook to "make laws" to confuse and invade, to expel prayers and the inseparable Christian ethics from schools, and now Congress. The school and other public building prayers, therefore, must not be considered isolated issues, but issues which envelop the founding religious principles, the U. S Constitution--safeguards for all liberties. It is for this reason that the prayers

have been exploited not only by the identifiable coalitions, but by Congressional incumbents and private non-invading efforts which exploit the issue for vast fund-raising profits. Victimizing Christians who have already been victimized by deceptions and denial of their moral environment--the very purpose of the Constitution--is a serious offense accountable to Title 18, U. S. Criminal Code, Sec. 241-242, 2000d, and 2384--seditious conspiracy. Yet, the frontiers in all Branches of government have "played the games" and accommodated the comfortable personal interests, disregarding integrity, duty to society, and the loss of Constitutional freedoms. There is no debate that the prayers issue, the invasions of atheism in curriculum, and further in government everywhere, have contributed to the moral crisis

addressed by J. Burger, 1980 Annual Report to the American Bar Association

It is of utmost urgency, therefore, that the "separation issue" the Murray plaintiffs court action objectives, be identified by the Supreme Court as anti-Christian, anti-Constitutional, and anti-American, excluding court-status. It cannot be overlooked that the denial of Christian neutrality, as guides in government, will deny all freedoms--none shall know liberty, as stressed in Ten Commandments on Trial, Citizens for God & Country, 1980.

The key to restoring the U. S. Constitution, therefore, is to alert the public by Supreme Court directives that prayers are permitted and that separation for atheism is an alien doctrine, unconstitutional, and accountable to Title 18. Since there is no punitive enforcement, the invading

coalitions arrogantly state, as for Title 36, U.S.C. 172-ONE NATION UNDER GOD, and similar laws, "we do not have to obey." Denial of atheists court-and-any-government-status is imperative for Constitutional and judicial security. Without this security there are no fundamental rights--Christian or non-Christian.

Other Supreme Court guides in the prayers issue in Abington follow: Parents sovereignty, student-initiated religious activity, and use of public buildings for temporary religious needs.

The specific details on prayer were that patriotic and ceremonial exercises were not ruled out for love of country and belief in God; prayers for "secular purposes" (should be "civic" purposes)--for upholding school order, enhancing unity, harmony authority; Bible for ethics, and curriculum; even legislated

prayers are permitted where a compelling interest is demonstrated.

It is imperative that the Supreme Court reassert the total Establishment Clause guides on prayers, Bible, Religion, Christian Holidays, and the details on Christian neutrality as guides to government administration.

Prayers, whether for Congress, military, or schools, are a vital part of the Establishment Clause, a guide-post, and safeguard for morality--the strength of a free nation.

See further details in Friend Petition; ten copies submitted.

II. ARGUMENT - ISSUE TWO - Prayers permitted for Congress.

> "The saying of invocational prayers in legislative chambers, state or federal, and the appointment of legislative chaplains, might well represent no involvements of the kind prohibited by the Establishment Clause.[75]

---

[75] "Compare Moulton and Myers, Report on Appointing Chaplains to the Legislature of New York, in Blau, Cornerstone of Religious Freedom in America (1949), 141-156, Comment 63 Col. L, Rev. 73, 97 (1963).

"Legislators, federal and state, are mature adults who may presumably absent themselves from such public and ceremonial exercises without incurring any penalty, direct or indirect. It may be significant that, at least in the case of the Congress, Art. 1, Para 5, of the Constitution makes each House the monitor of the Rules of its Proceedings, so that it is at least arguable whether such matter presents a political question" the resolution of which is exclusively confided in Congress. See Baker v. Carr, 369, U. S. 186, 232. [Emphasis added]

"Finally, there is the difficult question of who may be heard to challenge such practices . . ." See Elliott v. White 23 F 2d, 997. Abington (pp. 66, 67)

"Finally, the concept of standing is a necessarily flexible one, designed principally to ensure that the plaintiffs have 'such a personal stake in the outcome of the controversy as to assure that concrete adverseness which sharpens the presentation of issues upon which the court so largely depends for illumination of difficult constitutional questions . .'" Baker v. Carr, 369, U. S. 186, 204. Abington, (p. 50)

The Murray plaintiff-atheists, being militant atheists, attacking Christian faith, in their monthly magazine, The American Atheists, nationwide circulation, and harrassment lawsuits, have no right to any stake under the

Constitution, since they disrespect Christian ethics as guides to government administration, and since they have a history of hostilities against Christian ethics in government.

Since prayers in Congress are permitted, Abington (pp. 66, 67), there was no need for the judicial complications in Murray, granting status and shifting to H. Res. 413. Abington 68, Brennan stated:

> ". . . in Sunday law decisions, (we stated) nearly every criminal law on the books can be traced to some religious principle or inspiration. But that does not make the present enforcement of the criminal law in any sense an establishment of religion . . . McGowan v. Maryland, 366 U. S. 420, 442 . . . The Establishment Clause does not ban federal or state regulation of conduct whose . . . effect merely happens to coincide or harmonize with the tenets of some or all religions. 'In God We Trust' . . . may not offend the clause."

Even if there were a justification to shift to the legislative enactment of H. Res. 413, 1982, an unnecessary action, still, according to Abington, (pp. 66, 67) "the resolution . . . is

exclusively confided in Congress. See Baker v. Carr, 369, U. S. 186, 232. [Emphasis added]

It is very strange that the Appeals Court should have overlooked these vital details and directed court-status to the atheists-plaintiffs, further mishandling the very Baker v. Carr case which the Court brought in review, and ignoring the Abington directives for any prayers, in school or elsewhere.

Overlooked in the prayers issue is the usual emphasis of providing for Free Exercise. Nowhere, in specific cases is it spelled out that the institutions, under guides of Christian ethics, Biblical morality, are obligated as institutions in a Christian nation to consistently identify that Christian ethics guide their administration. To deny this fact is to deny the flying of the American flag.

III. ARGUMENT - ISSUE THREE - The three-prong test on Establishment neutrality, its irrelevancy, misapplications, and inadequacies which contribute to unconstitutional atheism in all institutions, threatening national security.

The three-prong test is unnecessary in Murray, since the Supreme Court decisions permit prayers in Congress. Abington (pp. 66, 67) Further, the prayers are not legislated, and have no relevancy to the test, which the plaintiff-atheists requested.

The three-prong test, where applied, has accommodated atheism, because it is disconnected from Christian law priority and Christian neutrality. It uses the term "secular" which is manipulated easily to "atheism;" the term "civic" would be better. It uses the term "religion" which is not defined with a clearer meaning of not promoting religion when the issue is non-sectarian Christian faith, as directed by Holy Trinity, and Everson, as Engel and Sydell Stone. The test relates only to "legislative enactment," not distinguishing

clearly that legislated prayers are related to the test, and unlegislated prayers are not. At no place does the test declare that even legislated prayers are permitted, where a compelling national interest is demonstrated. At no instance does it declare hostility, secularism, secular passivity, atheism, jeopardy, oppression, offense to Christian faith forbidden as the Abington neutrality guides do. Nor does it direct that ". . . it is the duty of government to deter no-religion belief . . ." Abington (pp. 32, 42, 55, 71, 72, 73; also 28).

Unrelated to denial of atheism and general Christian founding principles which structure the Constitution, the test provides for easy manipulation and political applications for secularization, atheism, endangering all rights. In many cases, this test has been dangerously misapplied, denying millions of citizens their God-given, inalienable rights--the moral environment--threatening the survival of institutions,

and attacking the vital safeguards of the First Amendment against "invasions," forbidden by Art. IV, Sec. 4.

The Supreme Court must review these hazards which have contributed severely to the national moral crisis, alerted by past Presidents and Congressmen.

The three-prong test is no substitute, nor an adequate guide, for the Abington details on Christian neutrality. After all, the issue of prayers cannot be separated from the total Supreme Court definition on neutrality, Christian neutrality--the founding religious principles which structure the Constitution. This serious error has added severely to the moral crisis, and caused many courts to stand in conflict; enter into confusion arguing among themselves as to what values guide jurisprudence--another compelling national interest. The test has been applied even to unlegislated prayers incorrectly. The confusion must be addressed in the interest of judicial integrity.

IV. ARGUMENT - ISSUE FOUR - For the National compelling interest.

At no time is it possible to isolate the issue of prayers, church-state, and discuss those details without identifying with the founding religious principles and their essential purpose of protecting against invasions. Therefore, the Arguments, while selective in sequence, overlap with details relating to other Argument Items. (See, also, Friend Petition.)

Holy Trinity did not hesitate to direct when identifying Christian faith as "common law" that "nothing be done to hurt Christianity; nor to direct: "Bring infidels and savages unto human civility for a quiet and settled government."

Everson (p. 40, ftn) declared the propriety of religion to protect the moral order, to "secure against invading corrupt coalitions."

Engel as Abington, and many other cases, provided for the compelling state interest

to justify the "making of a law" on religion in the interest of securing the moral order, the essence of survival for all free nations. Abington defined Establishment neutrality clearly by forbidding secularism, secular passivity; "duty of government to deter no-religion belief; no hostilities, jeopardy, oppression . . ." The U. S. Constitution forbids "invasions," Art. IV, Sec. 4.

Title 36, U. S. C. 172 One Nation Under God, identifies the need for this law to protect against "invasions of rabid communism." All State Constitutions compel Godly living, or Christian forebearance--"principles, frugality, and virtues."

Title 18, U. S. Criminal Code, Sec. 241-242, 2000d, and 2384 identify the invasions clearly, and include "seditious conspiracy."

Yet, the Supreme Court, and many lower courts, have sought ways to divert, evade,

and omit the reality in the legislative history of ONE NATION UNDER GOD:

> ". . . the very nature of man, which is the keystone of the arch of American government, is under attack by a system whose philosophy is exactly the opposite. One thing separates free people from the rabid communism, and that is belief in God. Adding this one phrase to our Pledge of Allegiance to our Flag, we declare openly that we denounce the pagan doctrines of communism."
> Rep. Rabaut, regarding Title 36, U. S. C. 172. [Emphasis added]

> "This action serves to deny atheistic and materialistic concepts of communism. It condemns the absolute and concentrated power of the communist slave state with its attendant subservience of the individual." Rep. John Pillon. [Emphasis added]

President Eisenhower stated:

> "Nothing could be more inspiring than to contemplate this rededication of our youth each school morning to our country's true meaning."

A theologian commented:

"God and only God is the last unfailing hope."

A Rabbi testifying before the House Judiciary Committee on Prayers, 1980, declared:

"Had Christianity prevailed in Germany, there could not have been any Holocaust."

CONCLUSION

1. The Murray plaintiff-atheists should be identified by their "separation" policy as anti-Christian, anti-Constitutional, ineligible for Court-status.

2. The issue of prayers is not isolated, but identifiable with unconstitutional invasions, attacking the U.S. Constitution.

3. Since prayers are permitted, the Murray Court should have upheld the Supreme Court.

4. Eminent domain for Congress is not subject to Court review.

5. Regardless, even if it were, religious freedom being fundamental, God-given, inalienable, outranks the political domain.

6. Disinformation strategies with mass-media supports, a compelling interest, need the Supreme Court protection.

7. Judicial obscuring, failing to uphold Supreme Court favorable guides on prayers, Bible, non-sectarian Christian, arguments among justices on what values guide jurisprudence, require Supreme Court supervision.

8. The youth moral crisis, judicial integrity, and the national security require the restoration of the moral environment as guaranteed by the Constitution.

Because of the foregoing, the Supreme Court must grant the Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

DATED this 20th day of July, 1982.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne Neamon

ANNE NEAMON